

Application No. 10/598,893

June 16, 2008

Reply to the Office Action dated February 27, 2008

Page 7 of 10

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 13-27 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends Claims 13 and 22.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that Claims 22-25 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 22 was objected to for containing minor informalities. Applicant has amended Claim 22 to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

Claims 13-16, 19, 20, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Puente (WO 2004/025778). Claims 17, 18, 21, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Puente. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of Claims 13-21, 26, and 27.

Claim 13 has been amended to recite:

An antenna comprising:

a substrate including a ground electrode;

a feeding radiation element including a feeding element and a radiation electrode disposed inside or outside a dielectric substance;

a first non-feeding radiation element electrically connected to the ground electrode and including a radiation electrode disposed inside or outside the dielectric substance; and

a second non-feeding radiation element electrically connected to the ground electrode and including a radiation electrode disposed inside or outside the dielectric substance; wherein

the feeding radiation element is disposed on the ground electrode such that a surface of the radiation electrode of the feeding radiation element is substantially parallel to a surface of the ground electrode along substantially the entire surface of the radiation electrode and such that the feeding radiation element is disposed in the vicinity of a desired side of four peripheral sides of the ground electrode;

the first non-feeding radiation element is disposed on the ground electrode such that a surface of the radiation electrode is substantially parallel to the surface of the ground electrode along

June 16, 2008

Reply to the Office Action dated February 27, 2008

Page 8 of 10

substantially the entire surface of the radiation electrode and such that the first non-feeding radiation element is disposed next to the feeding radiation element so as to be in the vicinity of the desired side of the ground electrode; and

the second non-feeding radiation element is disposed such that the second non-feeding radiation element is adjacent to both the feeding radiation element and the first non-feeding radiation element and such that at least a portion of the second non-feeding radiation element projects outside the ground electrode from the desired side of the ground electrode. (emphasis added)

With the unique combination and arrangement of features recited in Applicant's Claim 13, including the features of "the feeding radiation element is disposed on the ground electrode such that a surface of the radiation electrode of the feeding radiation element is substantially parallel to a surface of the ground electrode along substantially the entire surface of the radiation electrode and such that the feeding radiation element is disposed in the vicinity of a desired side of four peripheral sides of the ground electrode" and "the first non-feeding radiation element is disposed on the ground electrode such that a surface of the radiation electrode is substantially parallel to the surface of the ground electrode along substantially the entire surface of the radiation electrode and such that the first non-feeding radiation element is disposed next to the feeding radiation element so as to be in the vicinity of the desired side of the ground electrode," Applicant has been able to provide an antenna that achieves a reduction in the thickness and miniaturization of the overall size and that achieves a further increase in bandwidth, and a portable radio communication apparatus including such an antenna. (see, for example, paragraph [0018] of the Substitute Specification).

The Examiner alleged that Puente teaches all of the features recited in Applicant's Claim 13.

Applicant's Claim 13 has been amended to recite the features of "the feeding radiation element is disposed on the ground electrode such that a surface of the radiation electrode of the feeding radiation element is substantially parallel to a surface

Application No. 10/598,893

June 16, 2008

Reply to the Office Action dated February 27, 2008

Page 9 of 10

of the ground electrode along substantially the entire surface of the radiation electrode and such that the feeding radiation element is disposed in the vicinity of a desired side of four peripheral sides of the ground electrode” and “the first non-feeding radiation element is disposed on the ground electrode such that a surface of the radiation electrode is substantially parallel to the surface of the ground electrode along substantially the entire surface of the radiation electrode and such that the first non-feeding radiation element is disposed next to the feeding radiation element so as to be in the vicinity of the desired side of the ground electrode.” Support for these features is found, for example, in paragraphs [0066] and [0067] and in Figs. 1-3 of the originally filed application.

In contrast to Applicant’s Claim 13, as clearly shown in Fig. 7 of Puente, the vast majority of each of the elements 136 and 135, which the Examiner alleged correspond to first non-feeding radiation element and the second non-feeding radiation element recited in Applicant’s Claim 13, extend in a direction that is **substantially perpendicular** to the surface of the ground electrode, and only a very small upper portion of each of elements 136 and 135 extends in a direction that is substantially parallel to the ground electrode. Puente fails to teach or suggest that either of the elements 136 and 135 could or should have any other configuration, and certainly fails to teach or suggest that either of the elements 136 and 135 could or should be arranged on the ground electrode such that a surface of the element is substantially parallel to a surface of the ground electrode along substantially the entire surface of the element.

Thus, Puente clearly fails to teach or suggest the features of “the feeding radiation element is disposed on the ground electrode such that a surface of the radiation electrode of the feeding radiation element is substantially parallel to a surface of the ground electrode along substantially the entire surface of the radiation electrode and such that the feeding radiation element is disposed in the vicinity of a desired side of four peripheral sides of the ground electrode” and “the first non-feeding radiation element is disposed on the ground electrode such that a surface of the radiation

Application No. 10/598,893
June 16, 2008
Reply to the Office Action dated February 27, 2008
Page 10 of 10

electrode is substantially parallel to the surface of the ground electrode along substantially the entire surface of the radiation electrode and such that the first non-feeding radiation element is disposed next to the feeding radiation element so as to be in the vicinity of the desired side of the ground electrode" as recited in Applicant's Claim 13.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Puente.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 13 is allowable. Claims 14-27 depend upon Claim 13, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that Claim 13 is allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions the Commissioner for a One-Month Extension of Time, extending to June 27, 2008, the period for response to the Office Action dated February 27, 2008.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 16, 2008

/Christopher A. Bennett, #46,710/
Attorneys for Applicant

KEATING & BENNETT, LLP
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 850
Tyson's Corner, VA 22102
Telephone: (703) 637-1480
Facsimile: (703) 637-1499

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368
Christopher A. Bennett
Registration No. 46,710